

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 14, 2009 was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-47 were pending prior to the instant amendment. By this amendment, claims 1-4, 12-13, 18-19, 21-22, 25, 31, 36-37 and 44 are amended. Consequently, claims 1-47 are currently pending in the instant application, of which. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104995). Yamazaki, however, fails to render the claimed invention unpatentable. Each of the independent claims 1, 2, and 12, have been amended to recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways as recited above. On page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner states that the features of claim 2 including “a first gate electrode formed by a droplet discharge method is drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus.” Consequently, claim 2 has been amended to reflect, *inter alia*, the presence of a photocatalytic base film on the surface of the substrate (supported, for example, at least by paragraphs [0064]-[0067], [0070], [0154], [0168] or [0257] of corresponding US patent Application Publication No. US 2007/0120471 A1), and some characteristics of the first gate electrode (supported, at least, by the FIG. 1A and corresponding description). Accordingly, Yamazaki does not teach the claimed display device and method for fabricating a display device including the photocatalyst materials or forming a photocatalyst as a base film as recited in claims 1, 2, and 12.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (M.P.E.P. 706.02). Since each and every element, as set forth in the claims are not found either expressly or inherently described as required by the M.P.E.P., Yamazaki cannot be said to anticipate the invention as claimed. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 2 or 12 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1, 2 and 12. In addition, each of the dependent claims also recites combinations that are separately patentable.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0168966). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Suh (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0088106). Claims 13 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Miyazawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0127974). Claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0065345). Claims 18-22, 25, 30, 31, 36, 37, 44 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Miyazawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0127974) and Kiguchi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210361). Claim 23 was rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Miyazawa and Kiguchi, in further view of Natsuo (JP 2001-281438) which is cited in the Information Disclosure Statement. Claim 24

was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Miyazawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0127974) and Kiguchi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210361), in further view of Lee (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0165714). Claims 26-29, 32-35, 41, 45 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Miyazawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0127974) and Kiguchi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210361), in further view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0065345). Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Akedo (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0044259). However, each of the independent claims have been amended to recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways as recited above. At the very least, the applied reference fails to disclose or suggest any of these exemplary features recited in the independent claims.

For example, independent claims 3 and 4 have been amended to recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways as recited above. On page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner states that the features of including “a first gate electrode formed by a droplet discharge method is drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus.” Consequently, claims 3 and 4 have been amended to reflect, *inter alia*, the presence of a photocatalytic film on the surface of the substrate (supported, for example, at least by paragraphs [0064]-[0067], [0070], [0154], [0168] or [0257] of corresponding US patent Application Publication No. US 2007/0120471 A1), and some characteristics of the first gate electrode (supported, at least, by the FIG. 1A and corresponding description). Accordingly, Yamazaki does not teach the claimed display device and method for fabricating a display device including the

photocatalyst materials or forming a photocatalyst as a base film as recited in claims 3 and 4. Even more, the secondary reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Yamazaki by disclosing the missing elements as claimed.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways as recited above. The aforementioned amendment to claim 13 reflects, *inter alia*, the presence of a photocatalytic film on the surface of the substrate (supported, for example, at least by paragraphs [0064]-[0067], [0070], [0154], [0168] or [0257] of corresponding US patent Application Publication No. US 2007/0120471 A1). Accordingly, Yamazaki does not teach the claimed display method for fabricating a display device including forming a photocatalyst as a base film as recited in claim 13. Even more, Miyazawa fails to cure the deficiencies of Yamazaki by disclosing the missing elements as claimed.

Independent claims 18-19, 21-22, 25, 31 and 36-37 have been amended to recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways as recited above. The aforementioned amendments specify, *inter alia*, the formation of a photocatalytic base film in the display device fabrication method (supported for example by paragraphs [0064]-[0067], [0070], [0154], [0168] or [0257] of the corresponding US patent Application Publication No. US 2007/0120471 A1). Accordingly, Yamazaki does not teach the claimed display method for fabricating a display device including forming a photocatalyst as a base film as recited in claims 18-19, 21-22, 25, 31 and 36-37. Even more, the Miyazawa and Kiguchi fail to cure the deficiencies of Yamazaki by disclosing the missing elements as claimed.

Independent claim 44 has also been amended to recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways as recited above.

The aforementioned amendments specify, *inter alia*, the planarization method to include means of spraying a gas, supported, at least, by paragraphs [0180], [0185]-[0187] or [0190]-[0191] of the corresponding US patent Application Publication No. US 2007/0120471 A1).

Turning to page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner purports that Yamazaki “discloses a method for fabricating a display device including steps of forming a conductive film (110-113) and an insulating film (117) over an object (100).” The Examiner readily admits that Yamazaki does not specifically disclose preparing a treatment system including droplet discharge and planarization as recited in the claim. In an attempt to cure the deficiencies of Yamazaki, the Examiner provides Miyazawa to allegedly disclose (in paragraph 164) a method for fabricating a display device including a droplet discharge method. In addition, the Examiner turns to Kiguchi (e.g., at paragraph 38) to allegedly disclose a method for fabricating a display device, including using masking method and etching method to form patterns. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that this is correct, the purported prior art combination fails to disclose or fairly suggest, the existence of a plurality of chambers (one for droplet discharge and a second for planarization), the transfer from one chamber to the other without exposure to the atmosphere, and planarizing the conductive film and the insulating film in the second treatment chamber as recited in claim 44.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited prior art references, taken alone or in any proper

combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter as recited in the independent claims. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 3, 4, 13, 18-19, 21-22, 25, 31, 36-37, or 44 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 3, 4, 13, 18-19, 21-22, 25, 31, 36-37, and 44. In addition, each of the dependent claims also recites combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicant in no way intends to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned patent agent at (202) 585-8316.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Marc W. Butler, Reg. #50,219/
Marc W. Butler
Registration No. 50,219

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080